PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

See form PCT/ISA/220 WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORIT (PCT Rule 43 bis.1) Date of mailling (day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet) FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below Priority date (day/month/year) D9.07.2004 International application No. D9.07.2004 International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC C12NS/06, A61K48/00 Applicant RAY, Steven 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Priority Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. VI Lack of unity of invention Box No. VV Lack of unity of invention Box No. VV Certain documents cited Box No. VVI Certain documents cited Box No. VVI Certain decets in the international application Box No. VVII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VVII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VVII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VVII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VVII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VVII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VVII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VVII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VVII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VVII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VVII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VVII Certain defects in the international application Control of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant the international Bureau under Rule 66. 1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of ma					PCT WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY			
Date of mailing (day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet) POR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below International application No. PCT/GB2004.002981 International filling date (day/month/year) 09.07.2004 Priority date (day/month/year) 09.07.2003 International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC C12NS.06, A61K48.00 Applicant RAY, Steven 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Priority Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VII Certain observations on the international application Box No. VII Certain observations on the international application Further ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority of other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the international Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.		see form P	CT/ISA/220					
Applicants or agent's file reference see form PCT/SA/220 International application No. PCT/GB2004/002981 Og. 07.2004 International application No. Og. 09.07.2004 Priority date (day/month/year) Og. 07.2003 Priority date (day/month/year) O						(PCT Rule 43 <i>bis</i> .1)		
International application No. PCT/ISA/220 International papilication No. PCT/ISB/2004/002981 International filing date (day/month/year) 09.07.2003 Priority date (day/month/year) 09.07.2003 International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC C12N5/06, A61K48/00 Applicant RAY, Steven 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Priority Box No. II Priority Box No. II Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. IV Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application To admand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.						see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)		
PCTGB2004/002981 09.07.2004 09.07.2003 International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC C12N5/06, A61K48/00 Applicant RAY, Steven 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Priority Box No. II Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Certain documents cited Box No. VI Certain defects in the international application Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority (*IPEA**). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.								
Applicant RAY, Steven 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. Basis of the opinion			o.	_	day/month/year)			
1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion				both national classification	and IPC			
1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: □ Box No. □ Basis of the opinion □ Box No. □ Priority □ Box No. □ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability □ Box No. □ Lack of unity of invention □ Box No. □ Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement □ Box No. □ Certain documents cited □ Box No. □ Certain defects in the international application □ Box No. □ Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. □ Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.								
 ☑ Box No. II Priority ☑ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability ☑ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention ☑ Box No. IV Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited ☑ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application ② FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of malling of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. 								
 ☑ Box No. II Priority ☑ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability ☑ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention ☑ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited ☑ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. 	1.	This opinion cor	ntains indicati	ons relating to the fol	lowing items:			
 ☑ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability ☑ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention ☑ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited ☑ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. 		☑ Box No. I	Rasis of the or					
Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.			Dasis of the of	oinion		·		
Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.	•	Box No. Ⅱ	Priority			•		
applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement □ Box No. VI Certain documents cited □ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.	•		Priority		gard to novelty, inver	ntive step and industrial applicability		
 ☑ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. 		⊠ Box No. III	Priority Non-establish Lack of unity of	ment of opinion with rec of invention	•			
□ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.	•	☑ Box No. III☑ Box No. IV	Priority Non-establish Lack of unity of Reasoned sta	ment of opinion with rec of invention tement under Rule 43 <i>b</i>	is.1(a)(i) with regard	to novelty, inventive step or industrial		
2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.	·	☑ Box No. III☑ Box No. IV☑ Box No. V	Priority Non-establish Lack of unity of Reasoned sta applicability; of	ment of opinion with reg of invention tement under Rule 43 <i>b</i> itations and explanation	is.1(a)(i) with regard	to novelty, inventive step or industrial		
If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.	•	Box No. IIIBox No. IVBox No. VBox No. V	Priority Non-establish Lack of unity of Reasoned sta applicability; of Certain documents	ment of opinion with reg of invention tement under Rule 43 <i>b</i> itations and explanation nents cited	is.1(a)(i) with regard ns supporting such s	to novelty, inventive step or industrial		
written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.	•	 Box No. III Box No. IV Box No. V Box No. VI Box No. VII Box No. VII 	Priority Non-establish Lack of unity of Reasoned sta applicability; of Certain docum Certain defect	ment of opinion with reconfinvention tement under Rule 43 <i>b</i> itations and explanation nents cited	is.1(a)(i) with regard as supporting such supporting such supporting such supportion	to novelty, inventive step or industrial		
submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.	2.	 Box No. III Box No. IV Box No. V Box No. VI Box No. VII Box No. VIII Box No. VIII 	Priority Non-establish Lack of unity of Reasoned sta applicability; of Certain docum Certain defect Certain observa	ment of opinion with reconfinvention tement under Rule 43 <i>b</i> itations and explanation nents cited	is.1(a)(i) with regard as supporting such supporting such supporting such supportion	to novelty, inventive step or industrial		
	2.	Box No. III Box No. IV Box No. V Box No. VI Box No. VII Box No. VIII FURTHER ACTION If a demand for inwritten opinion of the applicant cholanternational Bur	Priority Non-establish Lack of unity of Reasoned state applicability; of Certain docum Certain defect Certain observational prefit the International prefit the Internation obsess an Authoreau under Rule	ment of opinion with regot invention tement under Rule 43 <i>b</i> itations and explanation ents cited is in the international apvations on the international eliminary examination is nal Preliminary Examinity other than this one	is.1(a)(i) with regard as supporting such s oplication onal application a made, this opinion ang Authority ("IPEA"	to novelty, inventive step or industrial tatement will usually be considered to be a). However, this does not apply where he chosen IPEA has notifed the		
3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.	2.	Box No. III Box No. IV Box No. V Box No. VI Box No. VII Box No. VIII FURTHER ACTI If a demand for in written opinion of the applicant chol International Bur will not be so cor If this opinion is, submit to the IPE months from the	Priority Non-establish Lack of unity of Reasoned state applicability; of Certain docum Certain defect Certain observation International prefet in the Internation ceau under Rukensidered. as provided at A a written regulate of mailing	ment of opinion with recomment under Rule 43 <i>b</i> , itations and explanation nents cited as in the international apvations on the international eliminary examination is nal Preliminary Examinionity other than this one 66.1 <i>bis</i> (b) that written cove, considered to be apply together.	is 1(a)(i) with regard as supporting such supporting such supplication and application are made, this opinion and authority ("IPEA" to be the IPEA and to opinions of this Interprinted with amendal with amendals.	to novelty, inventive step or industrial tatement will usually be considered to be a). However, this does not apply where the chosen IPEA has notified the rnational Searching Authority the IPEA, the applicant is invited to ments, before the expiration of three		
	2.	Box No. III Box No. IV Box No. VI Box No. VI Box No. VII Box No. VIII FURTHER ACTION If a demand for in written opinion of the applicant cholenternational Burwill not be so cor If this opinion is, submit to the IPE months from the whichever expire	Priority Non-establish Lack of unity of Reasoned state applicability; of Certain docum Certain defect Certain observation ON International prefet the Internation Deses an Authoreau under Rulensidered. as provided above as provided above a written register of mailing as later.	ment of opinion with regot invention tement under Rule 43 <i>b</i> itations and explanation nents cited as in the international apvations on the international eliminary examination is nal Preliminary Examinitity other than this one 66.1 <i>bis</i> (b) that written cove, considered to be a ply together, where apply of Form PCT/ISA/220 of	is 1(a)(i) with regard as supporting such supporting such supplication and application are made, this opinion and authority ("IPEA" to be the IPEA and to opinions of this Interprinted with amendal with amendals.	to novelty, inventive step or industrial tatement will usually be considered to be a). However, this does not apply where the chosen IPEA has notified the rnational Searching Authority the IPEA, the applicant is invited to ments, before the expiration of three		
		Box No. III Box No. IV Box No. V Box No. V Box No. VI Box No. VII Box No. VIII FURTHER ACTIV If a demand for in written opinion of the applicant chol International Bur will not be so cor If this opinion is, submit to the IPE months from the whichever expired	Priority Non-establish Lack of unity of Reasoned state applicability; of Certain docum Certain defect Certain observation ON International professes an Author coses an Author eau under Rukensidered. as provided above a written report date of mailing estater. Ins., see Form Priority of Priority Author Auth	ment of opinion with regot invention tement under Rule 43 <i>b</i> itations and explanation nents cited as in the international apvations on the international eliminary examination is nal Preliminary Examiniority other than this one 66.1 <i>bis</i> (b) that written cove, considered to be a by together, where apply of Form PCT/ISA/220 of PCT/ISA/220.	is 1(a)(i) with regard as supporting such supporting such supplication and application are made, this opinion and authority ("IPEA" to be the IPEA and to opinions of this Interprinted with amendal with amendals.	to novelty, inventive step or industrial tatement will usually be considered to be a). However, this does not apply where he chosen IPEA has notifed the rnational Searching Authority the IPEA, the applicant is invited to ments, before the expiration of three		
		Box No. III Box No. IV Box No. V Box No. V Box No. VI Box No. VII Box No. VIII FURTHER ACTIV If a demand for in written opinion of the applicant chol International Bur will not be so cor If this opinion is, submit to the IPE months from the whichever expired	Priority Non-establish Lack of unity of Reasoned state applicability; of Certain docum Certain defect Certain observation ON International professes an Author coses an Author eau under Rukensidered. as provided above a written report date of mailing estater. Ins., see Form Priority of Priority Author Auth	ment of opinion with regot invention tement under Rule 43 <i>b</i> itations and explanation nents cited as in the international apvations on the international eliminary examination is nal Preliminary Examiniority other than this one 66.1 <i>bis</i> (b) that written cove, considered to be a by together, where apply of Form PCT/ISA/220 of PCT/ISA/220.	is 1(a)(i) with regard as supporting such supporting such supplication and application are made, this opinion and authority ("IPEA" to be the IPEA and to opinions of this Interprinted with amendal with amendals.	to novelty, inventive step or industrial tatement will usually be considered to be a). However, this does not apply where the chosen IPEA has notified the rnational Searching Authority the IPEA, the applicant is invited to ments, before the expiration of three		

European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Rutz, B

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7828





International application No. PCT/GB2004/002981

IAP20 RESTITITIO 09 JAN 2006

Box No. I Basis of the opinion							
With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was field, unless otherwise indicated under this item.							
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).							
With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:							
a. type of material:							
☐ a sequence listing							
□ table(s) related to the sequence listing							
b. format of material:							
☐ in written format							
☐ in computer readable form							
c. time of filing/furnishing:							
□ contained in the international application as filed.							
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.							
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.							
3. In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating ther has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.							
4 Additional comments:							

International application No. PCT/GB2004/002981

_	Во	x No. II	Priority				
1.		The following document has not been furnished:					
		\boxtimes	copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(a)).				
			translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(b)).				
		Conse nevert	quently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has heless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.				
2.		has be	point on has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim ten found invalid (Rules 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international attendicated above is considered to be the relevant date.				
3	Δdı	ditional	observations if necessary				

International application No. PCT/GB2004/002981

	Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability							
7	The	questions whether the claimed ious), or to be industrially applications	inver able l	ntion appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non have not been examined in respect of:				
[⊐	the entire international application,						
☑ claims Nos. 1-32 with regard to IA								
because:								
	⊠	the said international application subject matter which does not use	n, or requi	the said claims Nos. 1-32 with regard to IA relate to the following re an international preliminary examination (specify):				
		see separate sheet						
ĺ		the description, claims or drawi unclear that no meaningful opin	ings ((indicate particular elements below) or said claims Nos. are so could be formed (specify):				
I		the claims, or said claims Nos. are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.						
. 1		no international search report h	nas b	een established for the whole application or for said claims Nos.				
!		the nucleotide and/or amino ac C of the Administrative Instruct		quence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex in that:				
		the written form		has not been furnished				
				does not comply with the standard				
		the computer readable form		has not been furnished				
				does not comply with the standard				
		the tables related to the nucleonot comply with the technical r	otide : equir	and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do ements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.				
		See separate sheet for further	deta	ils				

International application No. PCT/GB2004/002981

_	Вох	No. IV	Lack of unity of	invention	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
1.		In resp	onse to the invitatio	n (Form P	CT/ISA/206) to pay additional fe	ees, the applic	ant has:	
			paid additional fees	S.		·			
			paid additional fees	s under pro	otest.		•		
			not paid additional	fees.					
2.			uthority found that the tiplicant to pay addition		nent of uni	ty of invention is not	complied with	and chose	e not to invite
3.	This	Author	rity considers that th	e requiren	nent of unit	y of invention in acc	ordance with	Rule 13.1,	13.2 and 13.3 i
	-	omplie	d with				. :	.•	
	⊠ n	not com	plied with for the fol	lowing rea	sons:				
		see se	parate sheet						,
4.	Con	sequer	itly, this report has t	oeen estab	lished in re	espect of the following	ng parts of the	internation	nal application:
	⊠a	all parts	•						
	□ t	he part	s relating to claims	Nos.					•
		No. V				bis.1(a)(i) with regards		y, inventiv	e step or
1.	Stat	tement						· · · ·	
	Nov	elty (N)	•	Yes: No:	Claims Claims	5,7,9-11,13-45 1,3,4,6,8,12,46	· ·		
	Inve	entive s	tep (IS)	Yes: No:	Claims Claims	7,37-45 2,9-11,13-36			
	Indu	ustrial a	applicability (IA)	Yes: No:	Claims Claims	33-46 -			*. .*
9	Cits	ations a	nd explanations		·				

see separate sheet

International application No. PCT/GB2004/002981

Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application

The following defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted:

see separate sheet

10/563897

IAP20 Res' 4 POT PTO 09 JAN 2006

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

International application No. PCT/GB2004/002981

Re Item III

Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

Claims 1-32 relate inter alia to subject-matter considered by this Authority to be covered by the provisions of Rule 67.1(iv) PCT. Consequently, no opinion will be formulated with respect to the industrial applicability of the subject-matter of these claims (Article 34(4)(a)(I) PCT).

Re Item IV

Lack of unity of invention

The following (groups) of inventions have been identified:

- 1. method for the differentiation of a stem cell to an adult specialised cell by providing RNA extractable from cells comprising the desired cell type (Claims 1-5, 9, 10, 12-18, 46 (all partially), 6, 11, 19-36, 42-45 (all complete))
- 2. method for the differentiation of an adult specialised cell to a stem cell by providing RNA extractable from cells comprising the desired cell type (Claims 1-5, 9, 10, 12-18, 46 (all partially), 7, 37-41 (all complete))
- 3. method for the differentiation of a specialised adult cell to an adult cell of a different speciality by providing RNA extractable from cells comprising the desired cell type (Claims 1-5, 9, 12-18, 46 (all partially), 8 (complete))

The only feature linking the identified (groups of) inventions is the alteration of a property of a cell towards a property of a desired cell type comprising providing RNA extractable from cells comprising said cell type. This feature is neither novel nor inventive because it has been described in the prior art (see for example Niu et al., 1961 or DeCarvalho, 1978).

Re Item V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial appli cability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: NIU M. C. ET AL.: "Ribonucleic acid-induced changes in mammalian cells"

- PNAS, vol. 47, 1961, pages 1689-1700, XP002296833
- D2: DECARVALHO S.: "Effect of RNA from normal human bone marrow on leukaemic marrow in vivo" NATURE, no. 4872, 16 March 1963 (1963-03-16), pages 1077-1079, XP009036534
- D3: DECARVALHO S: "In vitro angiogenic activity of RNA from leukemic lymphocytes." ANGIOLOGY. JUL 1978, vol. 29, no. 7, July 1978 (1978-07), pages 497-505, XP009036537 ISSN: 0003-3197
- D4: DE LUCCA F L ET AL: "Effect of the calcium phosphate-mediated RNA uptake on the transfer of cellular immunity of a synthetic peptide of HIV-1 to human lymphocytes by exogenous RNA." MOLECULAR AND CELLULAR BIOCHEMISTRY. DEC 2001, vol. 228, no. 1-2, December 2001 (2001-12), pages 9-14, XP009036575 ISSN: 0300-8177
- D5: RASCATI R J ET AL: "Characterization of Fv-1 gene-product-mediated resistance transfer." INTERVIROLOGY. 1981, vol. 15, no. 2, 1981, pages 87-96, XP009036576 ISSN: 0300-5526
- D6: DECARVALHO S. AND RAND H. J.: "Comparative effects of liver and tumour ribonucleic acids on the normal liver and the Novikoff hepatoma cells of the rat" NATURE, no. 4767, 11 March 1961 (1961-03-11), pages 815-817, XP009036535
- D7: YANG S F ET AL: "Albumin synthesis in mouse uterus in response to liver mRNA." PROCEEDINGS OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. MAY 1977, vol. 74, no. 5, May 1977 (1977-05), pages 1894-1898, XP002296835 ISSN: 0027-8424
- D8: SANYAL S ET AL: "Effects of RNA on the developmental potentiality of the posterior primitive streak of the chick blastoderm." PROCEEDINGS OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. APR 1966, vol. 55, no. 4, April 1966 (1966-04), pages 743-750, XP002296834 ISSN: 0027-8424
- D9: WO 02/24873 A (FRANKS CHRISTOPHER RALPH; DELLA BITTA RUGGERO (IT)) 28 March 2002 (2002-03-28)

1. Novelty

- 1.1. Claims 1, 3, 4, 8 and 12 lack novelty over either one of D1-D8 which all describe the modification of cell properties by administration of RNA extracted from a desired cell type.
- 1.2. Claims 6, 19 and 20 lack novelty over D8 which describes the induction of

differentiation in stem cells by RNA extracted from other cells.

1.3. Claim 46 lacks novelty over D5 which describes a screening process for RNA that are able to induce a change of a cellular property, in particular resistance to ectopic retroviruses.

2. Inventive step (Art. 33(3) PCT)

- 2.1. The prior art contains no indication of a method which would allow to "redifferentiate" a differentiated cell into a stem cell by administration of RNA from the desired cell type (i.e. from stem cells). Claims 7 and 37-45 are thus considered novel and inventive (Art. 33(2) and 33(3) PCT).
- **2.2.** Claim 2 lacks inventive step over D6 which considers the use of RNA extracted from animal organs in the treatment of human disease (p. 816-817, bridging paragraph).
- **2.3.** Claim 33 lacks inventive step over D8 in combination with D9 because it was obvious for the skilled person that the induction of differentiation of stem cells by the administration of RNA would be applicable in the field of stem cell therapy.
- **2.4.** The remaining claims which are dependent on independent claims 1, 19, 20 or 33 as far as they are novel appear not to involve features which could form the basis for an inventive step because they involve mere obvious technical variations of the subject matter of the corresponding independent claims.

3. Industrial application (Art. 33(4) PCT)

For the assessment of the present claims 1-32 on the question whether they are industrially applicable, no unified criteria exist in the PCT Contracting States. The patentability can also be dependent upon the formulation of the claims. The EPO, for example, does not recognize as industrially applicable the subject-matter of claims to the use of a compound in medical treatment, but may allow, however, claims to a known compound for first use in medical treatment and the use of such a compound for the manufacture of a medicament for a new medical treatment.

Re Item VII

Certain defects in the international application

The subject matter of claim 5 appears to lack sufficiency of disclosure because the application contains no teaching how a genetic transformation of the cells altered by the method of the invention can be achieved. The examples provided appear not to

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

International application No.

PCT/GB2004/002981

comprise a test of the genetic manifestation of the transferred phenotype.